Protocol using kicked Ising dynamics for generating states with maximal multipartite entanglement

Sunil K. Mishra,[1,*] Arul Lakshminarayan,[2,†] and V. Subrahmanyam[3,‡]

[1]*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi - 221005, India*
[2]*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai -600036, India*
[3]*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur UP - 208016, India*

We present a solvable model of iterating cluster state protocols that lead to entanglement production, between contiguous blocks, of 1 ebit per iteration. This continues till the blocks are maximally entangled at which stage an unravelling begins at the same rate till the blocks are unentangled. The model is a variant of the transverse field Ising model and can be implemented with CNOT and single qubit gates. The inter qubit entanglement as measured by the concurrence is shown to be zero for periodic chain realizations while for open boundaries there are very specific instances at which these can develop. Thus we introduce a class of simply produced states with very large multipartite entanglement content of potential use in measurement based quantum computing.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Bg, 89.70.Cf, 75.10.Pq

arXiv:1408.1677v1 [quant-ph] 7 Aug 2014

Entanglement has been recently studied very extensively as it impacts both foundational as well as applied aspects of quantum theory (for a review see [1]). Along with studies aimed at understanding the nature of entanglement, its presence in condensed matter systems, especially spin chains, has been used as a good platform to study various aspects of many-body systems including quantum phase transitions [2–7]. One such widely studied system is the Ising model which exhibits a quantum phase transition when a magnetic field is applied in a direction transverse to the interaction [8]. A variant of the transverse-field Ising model, when the field is applied impulsively kicked via a Dirac delta comb, has been discussed in the literature [9–11]. Even in the presence of time dependence the transverse Ising model remains integrable via the Jordan-Wigner transformation [12] as the resulting fermions are free. These models can lead to very highly entangled states with multipartite entanglement.

Mutlipartite entanglement, whose understanding is still incomplete, has been investigated in many recent works [13, 14]. The generalized cluster states, or graph states, with highly persistent distributed entanglement, has been proposed as a model of quantum computation, distinct from the circuit model, the so-called one-way quantum computer [15–17]. Cluster states have also been experimentally obtained, for example see [18] and have been applied for constructing quantum error correcting codes, which for example has been realized experimentally recently [19, 20]. Here, we construct spin states with high multipartite entanglement using the kicked Ising model dynamics, by iterating the quantum-circuit protocol with the cluster states [21]. While graph states are constructed with qubits being the vertices of a graph and the edges representing Ising interactions, we may look upon the present study as what happens in the simplest case when the action of the gates is *iterated* on the resultant graph states. This iteration leads to nontrivial multipartite entangled states, as the single qubit vertex operations do not commute with the interaction-based two-qubit ones, as will be seen below. For a study of closely related Hamiltonians and more motivation see [11], especially from the quenching point of view. As the model considered here is closely allied to the the dynamics of quantum critical transverse-field Ising model, it can provide motivation and interest for the structure of the resultant many-body states. It may be noted in passing that that cluster states do not naturally occur as ground states of Hamiltonians [17], but the iterated cluster states, that we introduce here, are natural to obtain via time evolution.

Consider the Hamiltonian for a spin chain of L sites,

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} \sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(k - \frac{t}{\tau}) \sum_{j=1}^{L} \sigma_j^z \qquad (1)$$

when the period of the pulses is $\tau = \pi/4$. We will study the dynamics of an open spin chain here, the periodic chain can similarly be discussed. The propagator or unitary Floquet quantum map (in the sense of for example [22]) connecting states just before any two consecutive kicks is given by

$$U = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{L}\sigma_j^x\sigma_{j+1}^x\right)\exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{L}\sigma_j^z\right) \qquad (2)$$

The operator $\exp(i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_1^x\sigma_2^x)$ is the Cartan form of a CNOT gate [23, 24]. Thus we can represent and implement quite simply the evolution operator as a quantum circuit comprising of CNOT gates and one-qubit gates. At time $t = n\tau$, where $\tau = \frac{\pi}{4}$ and n is total number of kicks, the time evolved state is $U^n|0\cdots0\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ is the eigenstate of local σ^z operator. The non-triviality of the time evolution stems from the non-commutativity of the operators involving different Pauli matrices in Eq. (2). If the σ_z single qubit operators were not present, the resulting state for $n = 1$ was first studied as a "cluster state" [21].

We divide the spin chain into two blocks A with M spins and B with $N = L - M$ spins. For simplicity, we consider the case of $M = L/2$ first. The blocking of the lattice, along with relabeling of the sites is as shown in Fig. 1 for the open boundary conditions. Let us introduce the following notation

* sunilkm.app@iitbhu.ac.in
† arul@physics.iitm.ac.in
‡ vmani@iit.ac.in



FIG. 1. The partitioning of the spin chain chain into two blocks A and B, with relabelling of the sites.



FIG. 2. Quantum circuit implementing the unitary operation, and the resultant state after n steps. The state has exactly n nonlocal Bell pairs, apart from local unitaries that act on individual blocks.

for spin operators of different partitions, for $j \leq M = L/2$,

$$\vec{A}_j \equiv \vec{\sigma}_{M+1-j}, \text{ and } \vec{B}_j \equiv \vec{\sigma}_{M+j}. \tag{3}$$

Thus $\vec{A}_1$ and $\vec{B}_1$ represent the Pauli matrices for spins at locations M and $M+1$ respectively.

The entanglement between the two blocks is calculated from the entropy of block A (by tracing out the block B spins). In Fig. 3 the evolution of this entanglement in $|\psi_n\rangle$ is shown for open and periodic boundary conditions with $L = 20$ spins and equal blocks with $M = 10$. In a very remarkable way the entanglement increases with every iteration exactly by 1 ebit (entanglement between a maximally-entangled pair of qubits) in the open chain case and by 2 ebits for the periodic chain. Thus after $L/4$ ($L/2$) iterations, blocks A and B are maximally entangled in the periodic (open) chains, with an entanglement of $L/2$ ebits. In the periodic case, the translational symmetry ensures that this is the case for *every* block of $L/2$ consecutive spins, which makes it a very nontrivial state. Further iterations reverse the entanglement and lead to unentangled ones at $L/2$ and L iterations for the case of periodic and open chains respectively.

The unitary operator in Eq. (2) can be written using this notation and labeling as,

$$U = X_{AB} X_{AA} X_{BB} Z_A Z_B \equiv U_A U_B V_1, \tag{4}$$

where $X_{AB} = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_1^x B_1^x}$, $X_{AA} = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{L/2-1} A_j^x A_{j+1}^x}$ and $Z_A = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{L/2} A_j^z}$, with similar definitions for X_{BB} and Z_B. The operator $U_A \equiv X_{AA} Z_A$ is a multi-spin unitary, that uses one-qubit and two-qubit gates, acting on spins of partition A only, the interaction bond between the two partitions is represented by

$$V_1 \equiv U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger X_{AB} U_A U_B = \mathrm{e}^{-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_1^y B_1^y}. \tag{5}$$

In this format the unitary operator's nonlocal parts, as far as the partition $A:B$, is concerned are laid threadbare. Now, the powers of the unitary operator can be written as

$$U^n = U_A^n U_B^n V_n V_{n-1} V_{n-2} \cdots V_1 \tag{6}$$

where $V_n = U_A^\dagger U_B^\dagger V_{n-1} U_A U_B = {U_A^\dagger}^n {U_B^\dagger}^n X_{AB} {U_A}^n {U_B}^n$.

This can serve as a protocol for generating multipartite nonlocal entanglement using only one nonlocal two-qubit gate X_{AB}, acting always on the same two qubits. Given that $|\psi_0\rangle = \otimes^L |0\rangle$, it helps to find the states during the first few steps of the iteration. The quantum circuit implementing this unitary operation in Eq. (4) for n steps on the initial unenetangled state $|\psi_0\rangle$ is shown in Fig. 2, along with the resultant multipartite entangled state with n nonlocal (inter-partition) Bell pairs. It is helpful to also define the state $|\tilde{\psi}_n\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^n V_i |\psi_0\rangle$, which is well defined as the V_i are commuting operators as exhibited below.

We will calculate the von Neumann entropy $S_M(n)$ of the block with M spins as function of the time steps n. The state after the first step is straightforward to evaluate, only V_1 involves interaction between the partitions. The state after one time step is, $|\psi_1\rangle = U|\psi_0\rangle \equiv U_A U_B |\tilde{\psi}_1\rangle$, has exactly one ebit of entanglement distributed over all spins. Defining a Bell state between a pair of spins (located at l and m) as, $|\Phi_{lm}\rangle \equiv (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, we have,

$$|\tilde{\psi}_1\rangle = |0..0\rangle_{A_2..A_M} |\Phi_{A_1,B_1}\rangle |0..0\rangle_{B_2..B_M}. \tag{7}$$

In the state $|\tilde{\psi}_1\rangle$, the spins A_1 and B_1 at the interface between the blocks are in a Bell state, which has one ebit of entanglement. The state $|\psi_1\rangle$ has additional local unitary transformations U_A and U_B that act on individual blocks, which do not change the entanglement between the blocks. However, the two-party entanglement (calculated by the concurrence measure of entanglement [25]) between spins A_1 and B_1 is zero. This implies that the entanglement in the state $|\psi_1\rangle$ is of multipartite nature. Thus, we can use this protocol as a reverse-engineering tool to transform a local Bell pair entanglement into a nonlocal multipartite entanglement. Further, a local Bell pair entanglement can also be transferred to another local Bell pair, by changing the blocking scheme after generating the state $|\psi_1\rangle$, so that a different pair of spins is at the interface of blocks A' and B', through $|\tilde{\psi}_1'\rangle = U_{A'}^\dagger U_{B'}^\dagger |\psi_1\rangle$.

Turning to the calculation of $|\psi_2\rangle$, the state at the second step, the operator V_2 is required. The special value $\tau = \pi/4$ renders a remarkably simple and transparent form for this operator (As shown in the Supplementary Material [26]):

$$V_2 = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_2^y B_2^y A_1^z B_1^z\right). \tag{8}$$

In the state $|\psi_2\rangle = U_A^2 U_B^2 V_2 V_1 |\psi_0\rangle \equiv U_A^2 U_B^2 |\tilde{\psi}_2\rangle$, while V_1 flips the spins labelled A_1 and B_1, V_2 *retains* these while flip-

ping A_2 and B_2, thus we have,

$$|\tilde{\psi}_2\rangle = |0..0\rangle_{A_3..A_M}|\Phi_{A_1,B_1}\Phi_{A_2,B_2}\rangle|0..0\rangle_{B_3..B_M}. \quad (9)$$

The reduced density matrix ρ_A has four equal eigenvalues $\lambda = 1/4$ and the von Neumann entropy $S_{\frac{L}{2}}(n=2) = 2$ for the open chain as seen in Fig. 3. In the periodic boundary case we get von Neumann entropy of 4 ebits, as every time step increases the entropy by two units. The von Neumann entropy for general n such that $2 \le n \le M$ in the open chain can be derived by observing that (see details in the Supplementary Material [26])

$$V_n = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4}A_n^y B_n^y \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j^z B_j^z\right), \quad (10)$$

which may be proved for example by induction. Thus with every iteration the operator V acquires an additional two-spins in the interaction. This implies that the state $|\psi_n\rangle \equiv U_A^n U_B^n|\tilde{\psi}_n\rangle$ is given by,

$$|\tilde{\psi}_n\rangle = |0..0\rangle_{A_{n+1}..A_M}|\Phi_{A_1,B_1}..\Phi_{A_n,B_n}\rangle|0..0\rangle_{B_{n+1}..B_M}, \quad (11)$$

and the entanglement entropy for this state is n ebits. Thus in the open chain case when $n = M = L/2$, the maximum entanglement of $L/2$ ebits is achieved. In the closed chain, this time is reduced to $L/4$.

Beyond the time when the maximum entropy is reached, the expression for V_n is to be modified: In the open chain case with $M = L/2$, the operator V_{M+1} is given by (Details in the Supplementary Material [26]),

$$V_{M+1} = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4}A_M^x B_M^x \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} A_j^z B_j^z\right) \quad (12)$$

and subsequently till $n = L$, the operators with the highest index get decimated such that at V_{M+k} $(1 \le k \le M)$ the operator string involved is $A_{M-k+1}^x B_{M-k}^x A_{M-k}^z B_{M-k}^z \cdots A_1^z B_1^z$. It follows that $V_L = \exp(-i\pi A_1^x B_1^x/4)$ and $V_{L+1} = V_1$. Thus the interaction picture operators V_i are periodic, and it is also easy to check that they all commute with each other.

These can be used along with the observation that $\exp(-i\pi\sigma_1^x\sigma_2^x/4)(|00\rangle + i|11\rangle)/\sqrt{2} = |00\rangle$ to arrive at the state after $M+1$ kicks as $|\psi_{M+1}\rangle = U_A^{M+1}U_B^{M+1}|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle$,

$$|\tilde{\psi}_n\rangle = |0\rangle_{A_M}|\Phi_{A_1,B_1}\cdots\Phi_{A_{M-1},B_{M-1}}\rangle|0\rangle_{B_M} \quad (13)$$

which is block-local unitarily equivalent to $|\psi_{M-1}\rangle$ and thus the entanglement is $M-1$ ebits which is consistent with the open boundary case in Fig. 3. Thus further time evolution unravels the entanglement at the rate of 1 ebit per iteration, and in the periodic boundary case at the rate of 2 ebits per iteration till there is no entanglement at all. The block entanglement is a periodic function of n, and can be summarized within a period L $(L/2)$ for open (closed) chain, with $M = L/2$, as

$$S_M^{\rm Open}(n) = n + (M-n)\Theta(n-M)\Theta(2M-n), \quad (14)$$
$$S_M^{\rm Closed}(n) = 2n + (M-2n)\Theta(n-\tfrac{M}{2})\Theta(M-n), \quad (15)$$



FIG. 3. Block von Neumann entropy as a function of number of kicks is shown for periodic and open boundary cases for $L = 20$. The entanglement is maximum when n is an odd multiple of $L/2$ $(L/4)$ for open (closed) chain. For unequal-size blocks $(M = 8, N = 12)$ the entanglement remains constant for $M \le n \le N$ $(M/2 \le n \le N/2)$ for open (closed) chain.

where $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function. The entanglement reaches its maximum possible value $L/2$ at $n = L/2$ in the open chain case, while in the closed this happens at $n = L/4$ as the Bell pairs are formed from both the interfaces of the blocks, increasing the entanglement by 2 ebits every step. Fig. 3 shows the von Neumann entropy as a function of n in both cases for $L = 20$; the numerical calculation agrees exactly with the above calculation.

Now, let us consider the case of unequal block sizes M (for block A) and $N = L - M$, let $M < L/2$. The entanglement increases 1 ebit (2 ebits) for open (closed) chain till $n = M$ $(M/2)$ as in the case of equal size blocks, and it remains constant till $n = N$ $(N/2)$, and then decreases by 1 ebit (2 ebits) per step for further kicks. The reason for non-decreasing entanglement at step $n = M+1$ is due the structure of the operator V_{M+1}, given by,

$$V_{M+1} = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4}A_M^x B_{M+1}^y B_M^z \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} A_j^z B_j^z\right), \quad (16)$$

which is different from the operator shown in Eq. (12) (operator when the block sizes are equal). This operator will act on the state $|\tilde{\psi}_M\rangle$, with all sites from block A locked in Bell pairs with L_A number of sites from block B, to give the state at the next step $|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle = U_A^{\dagger M+1}U_B^{\dagger M+1}|\psi_{M+1}\rangle$, we have,

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle = |\Phi_{A_1,B_1}..\Phi_{A_{M-1},B_{M-1}}\rangle|0..0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N} \times \left(|0\rangle_{A_M}|\Phi_{B_M,B_{M+1}}\rangle + |1\rangle_{A_M}|\Phi'_{B_M,B_{M+1}}\rangle\right)/\sqrt{2}, \quad (17)$$

where we have used another Bell state $|\Phi'\rangle = (|01\rangle - i|10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ (See detailed derivation in Supplementary Material [26]). There are $M-1$ Bell pairs between the two blocks, and the spin A_M is entangled with the Bell pair state of the spins B_M and B_{M+1}. It is straightforward to see that the reduced density matrix ρ_A is proportional to the identity matrix, thus the von Neumann entropy is M at this time step. Similarly, the entropy will stay at this value till $n = N = L - M$,

and after that it decreases by 1 ebit (2 ebits) per step for open (closed) chain, showing a clipped sawtooth structure as seen in Fig. 3 for the case of $M = 8, L = 20$.

The remarkable algebraic properties of the model considered here lead to the high entanglement content and the creation of Bell pairs up to block-local operations. However this must *not* be construed as the creation of maximum entanglement between qubits, indeed it reflects very well the general observation that high multipartite entanglement, such as between the blocks A and B coexist with low entanglement amongst individual qubits. Let us examine how the two-qubit entanglement, viz. concurrence, varies with n by focusing on a pair of qubits A_i and B_i, one each from the two blocks. After $n > i$ kicks, but before the unraveling reaches these qubits, the state $|\tilde{\psi}_n\rangle$ has a Bell pair between the two marked qubits, but the state $|\psi_n\rangle$ has also the nontrivial action of block-local unitaries U_A and U_B. The reduced density matrix for the marked pair can be written in the form of a particular Krauss representation,

$$\rho_{A_iB_i} = \sum_k p_k Q_k^{A_i}(n) Q_k^{B_i}(n) \rho^{\rm Bell} Q_k^{A_i\dagger}(n) Q_k^{B_i\dagger}(n), \quad (18)$$

where $Q_k^{A_i}(n)$ are local operators for the qubit A_i and p_k are probabilities. These local operators generates the action of a quantum channel which is in general decohering and entanglement breaking. We have checked numerically that all pair concurrences are zero for all time steps for both open and periodic boundary conditions for sizes up to $L = 20$. The only exception is the central pair of qubits $\frac{L}{2}$ and $\frac{L}{2}+1$ in the open chain; this pair has a nonzero concurrence (of unity) at exactly $n = \frac{L}{2}$. To illustrate the nonzero concurrence for the central pair of qubits, we calculate the concurrence of the central pair (23) for the simple case of $L = 4$ explicitly. Using Eq. (7) and applying the local unitaries, the state after the first kick is, $|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(-|0000\rangle + |0101\rangle + |1010\rangle + |1111 + i(|0011\rangle + |0110\rangle - |1001\rangle + |1100\rangle))$. The reduced density matrix ρ_{23} is proportional to the identity, which is naturally a separable state. The operators Q_k (with $p_k = 1/4$) can be chosen as $Q_1^A = e^{-i\pi\sigma_2^z/4}$, $Q_1^B = e^{-i\pi\sigma_3^z/4}$, $Q_2^A = \sigma_2^x Q_1^A$, $Q_2^B = Q_1^B$, $Q_3^A = Q_1^A$, $Q_3^B = \sigma_3^x Q_1^B$, $Q_4^A = \sigma_2^x Q_1^A$, $Q_4^B = \sigma_3^x Q_1^B$. Apart from a local rotation of the Bell state implemented by $Q_1^A Q_1^B$, the channel is therefore a two-qubit Pauli channel. Similarly, the state after the second kick can be written as $|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle - i|0110\rangle - i|1001\rangle - |1111\rangle)$, and therefore $\rho_{23} = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| - i|11\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11| + i|00\rangle\langle 11|)$. For this reduced density matrix, the calculation of concurrence [25] gives the maximum value of 1, as quite simply the state corresponds to the pure maximally entangled state $(|00\rangle - i|11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Similarly, the concurrence is zero when n is even multiple of 2, and revives for odd multiples of 2. For a periodic chain, the concurrence remains zero for any number of kicks.

In conclusion, we have investigated a solvable model that may be interpreted as iteration of graph states and shows an entanglement growth of 1 ebit (2 ebits) per iteration for the open (closed) chain, The entanglement generated in the unitary evolution is multipartite in nature. On reaching the maximum possible block entanglement, for a contiguous block of $L/2$, it unravels and reaches zero after L iterations. These states can be used in protocols of quantum computation, considering their proximity to well investigated graph states. The state after each iteration reveals a very interesting algebraic structure through the commuting interaction picture operators V_i, that may be hidden in approaches using the Jordan-Wigner fermions. This study reveals a further interesting consequence of integrability of the tranverse field Ising model, but we emphasize that the features presented here are unique to the value of the parameter $\tau = \pi/4$, and hence the impulsive field plays an important role, and the features are easily revealed while remaining with spin operators rather than fermions.

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[2] S. Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 207901 (2003).
[3] V. Subrahmanyam, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 034304 (2004).
[4] J. I. Latorre and A. Riera J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **42** 504002 (2009).
[5] T. J. Osborne and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032110 (2002).
[6] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517 (2008).
[7] K. Sengupta and D. Sen, Phys Rev. A **80**, 032304 2009
[8] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, (Cambridge University Press, 1999).
[9] T. Prosen, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **139**, 191 (2000); Phys. Rev. E **65**, 036208 (2002); Physica D **187**, 244 (2004).
[10] A. Lakshminarayan and V. Subrahmanyam , Phys. Rev. A **71** 062334 (2005).
[11] S. K. Mishra and A. Lakshminarayan Euro. Phys. Lett. **105**, 10002 (2014)
[12] P. Jordan and E. Wigner, Z. Phys. **47**, 631 (1928); E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **16**, 406 (1961).
[13] N. Brunner, J. Sharam, and Tamas Vertesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110501 (2012).
[14] L. Arnaud, and N. J Cerf, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 012319 (2013).
[15] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
[16] M. A. Nielsen and C. M. Dawson, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 042323 (2005).
[17] M. A. Nielsen, Rep. Math. Phys. **57**, 147 (2006).
[18] Chao-Yang Lu, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Otfried Guhne, Wei-Bo Gao, Jin Zhang, Zhen-Sheng Yuan, Alexander Goebel, Tao Yang, and Jian-Wei Pan, Nature Physics, **3**, 91 (2007).
[19] B. A. Bell, D. A. Herrera-Mart, M. S. Tame, D. Markham, W. J. Wadsworth, and J. G. Rarity, Nature Communications, **5** 3658 (2014).
[20] M. Hein, J. Eisert, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 062311 (2004).
[21] H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910 (2001).
[22] M. V. Berry, N. L. Balazs, M. Tabor, and A. Voros, Ann. Phys.

(N.Y.) **122**, 26 (1979)
[23] M. Musz, M. Kuś and K. Życzkowski Phys Rev. A **87**, 022111 (2013)
[24] G. Vidal and C. M. Dawson Phys Rev A **69**, 010301(R) (2004)
[25] W. K. Wootters Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
[26] See the Supplementary Material for detailed calculation of V_n and states after each kick for unequal sized block case.

Supplementary Materials: Protocol using kicked Ising dynamics for generating states with maximal multipartite entanglement

I. CALCULATION OF V_n

From Eq. (4) in the main text, we see $V_1 = U_B^\dagger U_A^\dagger X_{AB} U_A U_B$. We have,

$$U_A^\dagger X_{AB} U_A = Z_A^\dagger X_{AA}^\dagger \left(\frac{1 - i A_1^x B_1^x}{\sqrt{2}} \right) X_{AA} Z_A. \tag{S1}$$

As X_{AA} commutes with the central quantity, we have

$$U_A^\dagger X_{AB} U_A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + i A_1^y B_1^x), \tag{S2}$$

where the identity $e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma^z}\sigma^x e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma^z} = -\sigma^y$ is used. Note the importance of the $\pi/4$ factor. Similarly the action of U_B changes B_1^x in X_{AB} to $-B_1^y$, we get

$$V_1 = \left(\frac{1 - i A_1^y B_1^y}{\sqrt{2}} \right) = \exp\left(-i \frac{\pi}{4} A_1^y B_1^y \right). \tag{S3}$$

The second interaction operator $V_2 = U_B^\dagger U_A^\dagger V_1 U_A U_B$ can be written as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(1 - i \tilde{A}_1^y \tilde{B}_1^y \right), \tag{S4}$$

where $\tilde{A}_1^y = Z_A^\dagger X_{AA}^\dagger A_1^y X_{AA} Z_A$. Now $X_{AA}^\dagger A_1^y X_{AA} = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}A_1^x A_2^x} A_1^y e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}A_1^x A_2^x} = -A_1^z A_2^x$. which follows from the identity

$$e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_1^x\sigma_2^x}\sigma_1^y e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_1^x\sigma_2^x} = -\sigma_1^z\sigma_2^x. \tag{S5}$$

Therefore finally $\tilde{A}_1^y = A_2^y A_1^z$ as

$$-e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}(\sigma_1^z+\sigma_2^z)}\sigma_1^z\sigma_2^x e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}(\sigma_1^z+\sigma_2^z)} = \sigma_2^y\sigma_1^z. \tag{S6}$$

Similarly B_1^y transforms to $B_2^y B_1^z$ and

$$V_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - i A_2^y A_1^z B_2^y B_1^z) = \exp\left(-i \frac{\pi}{4} A_2^y B_2^y A_1^z B_1^z \right). \tag{S7}$$

For $2 \le n \le L/2 - 1$ let

$$V_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - i A_n^y A_{n-1}^z \cdots A_1^z B_n^y B_{n-1}^z \cdots B_1^z). \tag{S8}$$

From this we show that $U_A^\dagger V_n U_A$ has the form of V_{n+1}, and hence prove the statement by induction. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &U_A^\dagger A_n^y A_{n-1}^z \cdots A_1^z U_A = (U_A^\dagger A_n^y U_A)(U_A^\dagger A_{n-1}^z U_A) \cdots \\ &(U_A^\dagger A_2^z U_A)(U_A^\dagger A_1^z U_A) = (-A_{n+1}^x A_n^x A_{n-1}^y)(A_n^y A_{n-1}^z A_{n-2}^y) \\ &(A_{n-1}^y A_{n-2}^z A_{n-3}^y) \cdots (A_4^y A_3^z A_2^y)(A_3^y A_2^z A_1^y)(-A_2^y A_1^x). \end{aligned} \tag{S9}$$

The operators in the "interior" are mapped to a string of three operators, while the "edges" contribute two. Using properties of Pauli matrices, this simplifies to $(-1)^{n-2} A_{n+1}^y A_n^z A_{n-1}^z \cdots A_1^z$. A similar relation holds for the B operators, and hence finally $V_{n+1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1 - i A_{n+1}^y A_n^z \cdots A_1^z B_{n+1}^y B_n^z \cdots B_1^z)$, as required.

The operator $V_{\frac{L}{2}+1}$ for open chain case can also be calculated as above. Observe however that there are now two "edges" the one with A_1^z and one with $A_{L/2}^y$. One encounters $U_A^\dagger A_{L/2}^y A_{L/2-1}^z \cdots A_1^z U_A$ which simplifies to $(-1)^{L/2-2} A_{L/2}^x A_{L/2-1}^z \cdots A_1^z$, with a similar expression for the B string. Thus at this turning point the lone y operators turn x, and $V_{L/2+1}$ is as given in Eq. (12). Further iteration requires $U_A^\dagger A_{L/2}^x U_A = -A_{L/2}^y$ which along with $U_A^\dagger A_{L/2-1}^z U_A = A_{L/2}^y A_{L/2-1}^z A_{L/2-2}^y$ results in the decimation of operators at position $L/2$ with the consequence that

$$V_{\frac{L}{2}+2} = \exp\left(-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_{L/2-1}^x B_{L/2-1}^x \prod_{j=1}^{L/2-2} A_j^z B_j^z\right). \tag{S10}$$

Further decimations lead to $V_L = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_1^x B_1^x}$ and finally $V_{L+1} = V_1 = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_1^y B_1^y}$.

II. UNEQUAL SIZED BLOCKS

Let us generalise the formalism in the manuscript by considering unequal size blocks. We divide the chain into two blocks A and B with M and $N = L - M$ number of spins, respectively, where $M < L/2$. Following the discussion in the preceding section for equal sized blocks, the spins in block A $(1, 2, \cdots M)$ are relabelled as $M, M-1, \cdots 1$ and spins in block B $(M+1, M+2, \cdots M+N)$ are labelled as $1, 2, \cdots N$.

$$\vec{A}_j \equiv \vec{\sigma}_{M+1-j} \text{ and } \vec{B}_j \equiv \vec{\sigma}_{M+j}. \tag{S11}$$

where the counting of spins is such that $j = 1, 2, \cdots, M$ in A side and $j = 1, 2, \cdots, N$ in B side ($N > M$). The equal block size can be retraced by $N = M = L/2$. The time evolution of the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle = \otimes^L |0\rangle$ can be calculated by applying powers of the unitary operator given by Eq. (6) in the main text. Till $n = M$, the time evolved state can be easily calculated by Eq. (12) of the main text and the block entanglement is given by $S_M^{\rm open}(n) = n$ for open chain case.

Afterwards for $n = M+1$, the state $|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle$ is calculated by applying operator $V_{M+1} = \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_M^x B_{M+1}^y B_M^z \prod_{j=1}^{M-1} A_j^z B_j^z)$ on $|\tilde{\psi}_M\rangle$ as

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{M+1}}} \sum_{\{a_i\}}^{M} \eta(\{a_i\}) |a_M \cdots a_1\rangle_A |a_1 \cdots a_M 00\rangle_B |0 \cdots 0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N} \\ + (1 - 2a_M) |\bar{a}_M a_{M-1} \cdots a_1\rangle_A |a_1 \cdots a_M 10\rangle_B |0 \cdots 0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N},\end{aligned}$$

where the operations $A_M^x |a_M\rangle = |\bar{a}_M\rangle$ and $B_{M+1}^y |0\rangle = i|1\rangle$ are performed. Since we are calculating states after $(M+1)^{\rm th}$ and $(M+2)^{\rm th}$ kicks, therefore, the last two qbits in the block B $M+1$ and $M+2$ are retained and rest of the qbits are put together as $|0 \cdots 0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N}$. Expanding the $M^{\rm th}$ bit in the summation of above equation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{M+1}}} \sum_{\{a_i\}}^{M-1} \eta(\{a_i\}) \big(|0 a_{M-1} \cdots a_1\rangle_A |a_1 \cdots 000\rangle_B + i|1 a_{M-1} \cdots a_1\rangle_A |a_1 \cdots 100\rangle_B \\ + |1 a_{M-1} \cdots a_1\rangle_A |a_1 \cdots 010\rangle_B - i|0 a_{M-1} \cdots a_1\rangle_A |a_1 \cdots 110\rangle_B\big) |0 \cdots 0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N},\end{aligned}$$

which can be rearranged in a nicer form as

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{M+1}\rangle = |\Phi_{A_1,B_1} \cdots \Phi_{A_{M-1},B_{M-1}}\rangle |0 \cdots 0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N} \left(|0\rangle_{A_M} |\Phi_{B_M,B_{M+1}}\rangle + |1\rangle_{A_M} |\Phi'_{B_M,B_{M+1}}\rangle\right)/\sqrt{2}, \tag{S12}$$

where $|\Phi_{l,m}\rangle = (|00\rangle - i|11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\Phi'_{l,m}\rangle = (|01\rangle - i|10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ are Bell states between a pair of spins located at l and m. The reduced density matrix ρ_A (or ρ_B) has 2^M equal eigenvalues $1/2^M$ and the block entanglement is $S_M^{\rm open}(M+1) = M$. This shows that $(M+1)^{\rm th}$ kick does not generate any new ebit between blocks A and B and the entanglement is already exhausted to a saturation value M. In order to confirm the saturation of entanglement let us calculate one more iteration for $(M+2)^{\rm th}$ kick. The $(M+2)^{\rm th}$ power of unitary operator requires $V_{M+2} = U_B^\dagger U_A^\dagger V_{M+1} U_A U_B$. The calculation of V_{M+2} requires the same method as discussed in Section I and more specifically needs following operator relations $U_A^\dagger A_M^x U_A = -A_M^y$, $U_A^\dagger A_{M-1}^z U_A = A_M^y A_{M-1}^z A_{M-2}^y$ and $U_B^\dagger (B_{M+1}^y B_M^z \cdots B_1^z) U_B = B_{M+2}^y B_{M+1}^z B_M^z \cdots B_1^z$. Using the properties of Pauli matrices, we can write the expression for V_{M+2} as

$$V_{M+2} = \exp(-i\frac{\pi}{4} A_{M-1}^x B_{M+2}^y B_{M+1}^z B_M^z B_{M-1}^z \prod_{j=1}^{M-2} A_j^z B_j^z). \tag{S13}$$

Using the relation $|\tilde{\psi}_{M+2}\rangle = V_{M+2}V_{M+1}|\tilde{\psi}_M\rangle$ we calculate the state after $(M+2)^{\text{th}}$ kick.

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{M+2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^M}}\sum_{\{a_i\}}^{M}\eta(\{a_i\})|a_M a_{M-1}\cdots a_1\rangle_A|a_1\cdots a_M 00\rangle + |\bar{a}_M\bar{a}_{M-1}a_{M-2}\cdots a_1\rangle_A|a_1\cdots a_M 11\rangle_B$$
$$+ |a_M\bar{a}_{M-1}a_{M-2}\cdots a_1\rangle_A|a_1\cdots a_{M-2}a_{M-1}a_M 01\rangle_B + (1-2a_{M-1})|\bar{a}_M a_{M-1}a_{M-2}\cdots a_1\rangle_A|a_1\cdots a_M 10\rangle_B.$$

By expanding the m^{th} and $(m-1)^{\text{th}}$ bits in the summation, we can express the state as

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{M+2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^M}}\sum_{\{a_i\}}^{M}\eta(\{a_i\})|a_{M-2}\cdots a_1\rangle_A|a_1\cdots a_{M-2}\rangle_B|\chi(a_{M-1},a_M)\rangle, \tag{S14}$$

or in a more compact manner as

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{M+2}\rangle = |\Phi_{A_1,B_1}\cdots\Phi_{A_{M-2},B_{M-2}}\rangle|\chi(a_{M-1},a_M)\rangle|0\cdots 0\rangle_{B_{M+2}..B_N}, \tag{S15}$$

where state $|\chi(a_{M-1},a_M)\rangle$ is a composite state of $(M-1)^{\text{th}}$ and M^{th} qubits of block A as well as $(M-1)^{\text{th}}$, M^{th}, $(M+1)^{\text{th}}$ and $(M+2)^{\text{th}}$ qubits of block B and can be easily calculated by expanding Eq. (S14). The explicit form of these states are given as $|\chi(0,0)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|0000\rangle + |1001\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1111\rangle$, $|\chi(0,1)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|0001\rangle + |1000\rangle + |0111\rangle - |1110\rangle$, $|\chi(1,0)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|0010\rangle + |1011\rangle + |0100\rangle - |1101\rangle$ and $|\chi(1,1)\rangle = \frac{1}{2}|0011\rangle - |1010\rangle + |0101\rangle + |1100\rangle$. Again, the reduced density matrix has 2^M equal eigenvalues $1/2^M$ and block entanglement $S_M^{\text{open}}(M+2) = M$. For further kicks the entanglement does not change from the value at kick $n = M$ and remains constant till $n = N$. Afterwards the entropy starts decreasing in a unit step and reaches to zero after L kicks.